

**CV 13**

**5293**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----- x  
DIANE GIBBS and CHARLES BRIGGS,  
Plaintiffs,

-against-

THE CITY OF NEW YORK, POLICE OFFICER JAVIER  
O. MUNOZ, SHIELD # 10519, JOHN DOE # 1-7  
Defendants,  
----- X

COMPLAINT  
AND JURY DEMAND

AMON, CH.J.  
LEVY, M.J.

FILED  
CLERK  
SEP 24 AM 11:56  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT  
OF NEW YORK

Plaintiffs DIANE GIBBS and CHARLES BRIGGS, by their attorneys, Stoll, Glickman & Bellina, LLP, for their complaint alleges as follows:

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

1. This is a civil rights action in which plaintiffs seek relief through 42 U.S.C. §1983 for the violation of their Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment rights.

2. The claim arises from a July 12, 2012 incident in which Officers of the New York City Police Department ("NYPD"), acting under color of state law, intentionally and willfully subjected plaintiffs to, among other things, false arrest and false imprisonment.

3. Plaintiffs seek monetary damages (special, compensatory, and punitive) against defendants, as well as an award of costs and attorneys' fees, and such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

**JURISDICTION**

4. This action arises under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and under 42 U.S.C. §1983 and §1988 and the laws and Constitution of the State of New York.

5. The jurisdiction of this court is predicated upon 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343(a)(3) and (4), 1367(a) and the doctrine of pendent jurisdiction.

6. The amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00 excluding interest and costs.

**VENUE**

7. Venue is laid within the Eastern District of New York in that Defendant City of New York is located within, and a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claim occurred within the boundaries of the Eastern District.

**PARTIES**

8. Plaintiff Diane Gibbs is a citizen of the United States and at all times here relevant resided in Brooklyn New York.

9. Plaintiff Charles Briggs is a citizen of the United States and at all times here relevant resided in Brooklyn New York.

10. The City of New York (or "the City") is a municipal corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant City, acting through the New York Police Department (or "NYPD"), was responsible for the policy, practice, supervision, implementation, and conduct of all NYPD matters and was responsible for the appointment, training, supervision, discipline and retention and conduct of all NYPD personnel. In addition, at all times here relevant, Defendant City was responsible for enforcing the rules of the NYPD, and for ensuring that the NYPD personnel obey the laws of the United States and the State of New York.

11. Police Officer Javier O. Munoz, Shield # 10519 was, at all times here relevant, a police officer of the NYPD, and as such each was acting in the capacity of an agent, servant and employee of the City of New York. On information and belief, at all times relevant hereto, Officer Munoz was under the command of the NYPD's 75th precinct. Upon information and belief, officer Munoz was personally present for the illegal arrest of plaintiffs. The defendant

officer is sued in his individual capacity.

12. John Does #1-7 are individuals whose names are currently unknown to plaintiff, and are employees of the NYPD. John Does #1-7 were present for and assisted in plaintiffs' arrests. John Does #1-7 are sued in their individual capacity.

13. At all times here mentioned defendants were acting under color of state law, to wit, under color of the statutes, ordinances, regulations, policies, customs and usages of the City and State of New York.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

14. Plaintiffs Diane Gibbs and Charles Briggs reside together in Brooklyn NY.

15. On July 12, 2012 at approximately 2:30 pm, Charles Briggs was walking in the vicinity of Ridgewood Avenue and Logan Street in Brooklyn NY.

16. Mr. Briggs encountered a friend and stopped briefly to speak with him.

17. As Mr. Briggs was speaking with his friend, defendant police officers approached them.

18. Defendants demanded to see Mr. Briggs identification, which he produced.

19. Defendants proceeded to physically search Mr. Briggs without consent or other legal basis to search him.

20. Nothing illegal was found during the search of Mr. Briggs.

21. Mr. Briggs had committed no criminal activity, nor did defendants have probable cause or reasonable suspicion that plaintiff had committed any criminal activity.

22. Defendants placed Mr. Briggs under arrest and took him to a police precinct.

23. Mr. Briggs was questioned at the police precinct for several hours.

24. Later that night Ms. Gibbs was alerted that Mr. Briggs was at the police precinct. At approximately 11:30 pm, she began preparing to go the precinct with a sweatshirt for Mr. Briggs.

25. Before Ms. Gibbs left her apartment, defendant police officers came to her door and demanded she allow them to enter.

26. Ms. Gibbs refused to open the door and informed the defendants that she did not wish to speak with them.

27. The defendants repeatedly threatened Ms. Gibbs with arrest if she did not open the door.

28. As a result of the threats, Ms. Gibbs agreed to open the door only to speak with the defendants. She then opened the door partway intending to speak with the officers through the doorway.

29. As Ms. Gibbs opened the door partially, the defendants forced their way into the apartment.

30. Defendants entrance into plaintiffs' home was without a valid warrant, consent, or other legal basis to enter their home.

31. Ms. Gibbs immediately and repeatedly objected to the officer's presence in her home.

32. Ms. Gibbs was detained for the duration of the officer's search of her home.

33. In the course of their search, the officers encountered a safe which they demanded Ms. Gibbs open for them. When she refused, the officers pried the safe open with a crow bar. The safe did not contain any contraband. In fact it contained nothing but the plaintiffs' important papers.

34. The officers left the plaintiffs' apartment at approximately 2:35 am.

35. Nothing illegal was found in the plaintiffs' apartment.

36. On July 13, 2013 Mr. Briggs was taken to Central Booking for arraignment.

37. At approximately 6:00 pm on July 13, 2013 the district attorney's office declined to

prosecute Mr. Briggs and he was released without charges.

38. In total Mr. Briggs spent approximately 26 hours in police custody as a result of the unlawful arrest.

39. In total Ms. Gibbs was detained in her home for approximately three hours during the illegal search of her home.

40. At no time did either plaintiff commit any crime. Moreover the defendants lacked probable cause or reasonable suspicion to believe plaintiffs had committed any crime.

41. At all times during the events described above, the defendant police officers were engaged in a joint venture and formed an agreement to violate plaintiffs' rights. The individual officers assisted each other in performing the various actions described and lent their physical presence and support and the authority of their office to each other during said events. They failed to intervene in the obviously illegal actions of their fellow officers against plaintiffs.

42. During all of the events above described, defendants acted maliciously and with intent to injure plaintiffs.

### **DAMAGES**

43. As a direct and proximate result of the acts of defendants, plaintiffs suffered the following injuries and damages:

- a. Violation of their rights pursuant to the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution to be free from an unreasonable search and seizure of his person;
- b. Violation of his rights to Due Process of Law under the Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution;
- c. Violation of his New York State Constitutional rights under Article 1, Section 12

their employees, agents, and servants, in that, after learning of their employees' violation of plaintiffs' constitutional rights, they failed to remedy the wrong; they have created a policy or custom under which unconstitutional practices occurred and allowed such policies or customs to continue, and they have been grossly negligent in managing subordinates who caused the unlawful condition or event. The City has been alerted to the regular use of excessive force and false arrests by its police officers, but has nevertheless exhibited deliberate indifference to such excessive force and false arrests; that deliberate indifference caused the violation of plaintiffs' constitutional rights in this case.

50. The City's continuing failure to deter police misconduct has led to ever increasing numbers of lawsuits for repeat routine misconduct by the same officers, same units and same precincts. In 2012, New York City paid out over \$131 million for the fiscal year, compared to 2011, when it paid out more than \$166 million, and 2010, when it paid \$128 million.<sup>1</sup> In the past ten years, the City of New York has paid nearly a billion dollars on lawsuits brought against the NYPD.<sup>2</sup> More than 40% of those settlements in 2011 stem from excessive force and false arrest.

51. The widely held assumption is that civil rights lawsuits deter police misconduct. "The purpose of § 1983 is to deter state actors from using the badge of their authority to deprive individuals of their federally guaranteed rights and to provide relief to victims if such deterrence fails. Wyatt v. Cole, 504 U.S. 158, 161, (1992) citing Carey v. Piphus, 435 U.S. 247, 254-257, (1978). "As far as we know, civil liability is an effective deterrent [to civil rights violations], as we have assumed it is in other contexts." See Hudson v. Michigan 547 U.S. 586, 598 (2006)

---

<sup>1</sup> Mayor Michael Bloomberg's preliminary Management Report for FY 2013, available at [http://www.nyc.gov/html/ops/downloads/pdf/pmmr2013/2013\\_pmmr.pdf](http://www.nyc.gov/html/ops/downloads/pdf/pmmr2013/2013_pmmr.pdf), see page 6, last visited on June 25, 2013.

<sup>2</sup> "NYPD Has Paid Out Nearly \$1 Billion in Claims Over Past Decade," by Associated Press Writers Colleen Long and Jennifer Peltz, <http://www.law.com/jsp/article.jsp?id=1202473432953>, October 15, 2010 last visited on June 25, 2013.

to be free from an unreasonable search and seizure;

- d. Violation of his New York State Constitutional rights under Article 1, Section 6 to due process;
- e. Emotional trauma and suffering, including fear, embarrassment, humiliation, emotional distress, frustration, extreme inconvenience, anxiety;
- f. Loss of liberty;
- g. Loss of property.

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
(42 U.S.C. § 1983)

44. The above paragraphs are here incorporated by reference.

45. Defendants have deprived plaintiffs of their civil, constitutional and statutory rights under color of law and have conspired to deprive them of such rights and are liable to plaintiffs under 42 USC § 1983.

46. Defendants' conduct deprived plaintiffs of their right to be free of unreasonable searches and seizures, pursuant to the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. Defendants' conduct also deprived plaintiffs of their right to due process of law, pursuant to the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

47. Defendants falsely arrested plaintiffs, and failed to intervene in each other's obviously illegal actions.

48. Plaintiffs have been damaged as a result of defendants' wrongful acts.

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
(MUNICIPAL AND SUPERVISORY LIABILITY)

48. The above paragraphs are here incorporated by reference.

49. The City is liable for the damages suffered by plaintiffs as a result of the conduct of

citing Correctional Services Corp. v. Malesko, 534 U.S. 61, 70 (2001) and Nix v. Williams, 467 U.S. 431, 446, (1984). “It is almost axiomatic that the threat of damages has a deterrent effect (citation omitted) surely particularly so when the individual official faces personal financial liability.” Carlson v. Green, 446 U.S. 14, 21, (1980), citing Imbler v. Pachtman, 424 U.S. 409, 442, and footnote 6 (1976).

52. However, the City of New York has isolated NYPD officers from accountability for its civil rights lawsuits by indemnifying officers who violate the constitutional rights of citizens, and, as a result, is preventing civil rights lawsuits from having any deterrent value to the City, the NYPD or its officers. Civil rights lawsuits against police officers have no impact on the officers’ careers, regardless of the expense to the City of the officers’ lawsuit liability, even after multiple lawsuits. In 1999, former Comptroller Alan Hevesi reported that there was a “a total disconnect” between the settlements of even substantial civil claims and police department action against officers. This “total disconnect” between officers’ liability and NYPD discipline, results in a system where the City pays vast sums to settle false arrests, but the NYPD does nothing to investigate nor address the underlying causes of such false arrests or officers who have incurred large sums of civil rights liability. The City Council, Government Operations Committee, despite being alerted at a City Council hearing on December 12, 2009, and on other occasions, to the obvious problem of officers and precincts with a disproportionate responsibility for civil rights lawsuit liability, has failed to take action to hold officers or precincts accountable. It has likewise failed to hold an investigative hearing into what extent specific officers, units and precincts are disproportionately responsible for New York City civil rights lawsuits.

53. The City is liable for the damages suffered by plaintiffs in that, after learning of their employees’ violation of plaintiffs’ constitutional rights, they failed to remedy the wrong; they



2000, the City has isolated its law department from the discipline of police officers. Civil rights lawsuits against police officers have no impact on the officers' careers, regardless of the officers' responsibility lawsuit liability, even after multiple lawsuits. Alan Hevesi, as New York City Comptroller, in 1999 reported that there was a "a total disconnect" between the settlements of even substantial civil claims and police department action against officers. Nothing has changed since 1999 and the present regarding this "total disconnect" between officers' liability and NYPD discipline, resulting in a system where the City pays vast sums to settle false arrests, but the NYPD does nothing to investigate nor address the underlying causes of such false arrests.

58. The City has also been alerted to the regular use of stop and frisks by its police officers, which disproportionately target people of color, despite the lack criminal evidence that such stop and frisks actually produce, and despite the humiliation, inconvenience and constitutional violations that the majority of law-abiding people, mostly in communities of color, suffer as a result. In 2008, of the 531,159 New Yorkers were stopped by the police, 465,413 were totally innocent (88 percent). From the total, 271,602 were black (51 percent); 167,111 were Latino (32 percent); and 57,407 were white (11 percent). In 2007, of the 468,732 New Yorkers were stopped by the police, 407,923 were totally innocent (87 percent). From the total in 2007, 242,373 were black (52 percent), 142,903 were Latino (31 percent), 52,715 were white (11 percent).<sup>3</sup>

59. The City is also aware that the misconduct does not stop at the regular use of stop and frisks to violate the civil rights of innocent people. In 2008, more than half (51%) of the summonses issued by NYPD officers were dismissed for legally insufficient evidence. Police officers have repeatedly told New York City news investigations that their supervisors pressure

---

<sup>3</sup> See New York Civil Liberties Union "Stop and Frisk Report" available at <http://www.nyclu.org/issues/racial-justice/stop-and-frisk-practices> last visited on June 25, 2013.

such policies or customs to continue, and they have been grossly negligent in managing subordinates who caused the unlawful condition or event.

54. The aforesaid event underlying plaintiffs' factual allegations was not an isolated incident. The City has been aware for some time, from lawsuits, notices of claim, complaints filed with the Civilian Complaint Review Board, and judicial rulings suppressing evidence and finding officers incredible as a matter of law, that a disturbing number of their police officers unlawfully search and seize citizens, bring charges against citizens with no legal basis, perjure themselves in charging instruments and testimony, and fail to intervene in and report the obviously illegal actions of their fellow officers. Nevertheless, the City has allowed policies and practices that allow the aforementioned to persist.

55. The City has been alerted to the regular use of false arrests by its police officers, through lawsuits, civilian complaints, notices of claim, City Council hearings, newspaper reports, and cases resulting in declined prosecutions and dismissals, but has nevertheless exhibited deliberate indifference to such false arrests; that deliberate indifference caused the violation of plaintiff's constitutional rights in this case.

56. Nevertheless, the City has repeatedly resisted attempts to catalog even basic information gleaned from civil rights lawsuits that could improve training, leadership, supervision, and discipline in the NYPD. The City's deliberate indifference towards the contents of civil rights litigation, towards individual officers repeatedly named in lawsuits, towards incidents repeatedly occurring in the same precinct, towards patterns of misconduct that arise in civil rights litigation has caused the constitutional violations against plaintiff.

57. Additionally, according to a report of the New York City Bar Association issued in

60. The Civilian Complaint Review Board (“the CCRB”), a City police oversight agency, often finds complainants lack credibility based in part on the fact that such complainants have also brought lawsuits to remedy the wrongs they have experienced, a practice that often results in not substantiating the most serious charges brought to the CCRB. In addition, the CCRB virtually never initiates their own findings of false statements against officers who have made false statements to the CCRB in their own defense, nor do they initiate findings that officers have failed to report their fellow officers’ misconduct; thus, officers have no real incentive to come forward, or to testify truthfully at the CCRB. The CCRB has no enforcement mechanisms once making a finding against an officer; it can only make recommendations to the NYPD, once finding misconduct by an officer.

61. The NYPD, once receiving a substantiated complaint by the CCRB, fails to adequately discipline officers for misconduct. In 2002, the percentage of officers who were the subject of substantiated CCRB complaints who received no discipline was 47%; in 2007, it was 75%.<sup>5</sup> The NYPD Department Advocate, which is endowed with the responsibility of following up on substantiated CCRB charges, is understaffed and under-utilized. Furthermore, in the extraordinarily rare event that the CCRB substantiates a complaint and the Department Advocate proves the case in an internal trial against an officer, the police commissioner still maintains the power to reduce the discipline against such an officer, which the police commissioner has done on many occasions. This entire procedure provide so many opportunities for meritorious

---

<sup>4</sup> See WABC’s Jim Hoffer’s three installments (March 3, May 23 and May 25, 2010) on NYPD quotas available at <http://abclocal.go.com/wabc/story?section=news/investigators&id=7461355> last visited on June 25, 2013.

<sup>5</sup> The NYCLU issued a report in September 2007 on the CCRB detailing the failure of the NYPD to follow up on substantiated CCRB complaints, among other failures by the City and the CCRB to address police misconduct: “Mission Failure: Civilian Review of Policing in New York City, 1994-2006”, available at: [http://www.nyclu.org/files/ccrb\\_failing\\_report\\_090507.pdf](http://www.nyclu.org/files/ccrb_failing_report_090507.pdf), last visited on June 25, 2013.

complaints of false arrests to be dismissed or disregarded that there is no credible, effective oversight of police department employees, despite an apparently elaborate set of oversight mechanisms.

62. Further, the City has no procedure to notify individual officers or their supervisors of unfavorable judicial review of their conduct or to calculate the total liability of an individual officer or of a precinct. Without this notification, improper search and seizure practices and incredible testimony go uncorrected, problematic supervision or leadership at the precinct level goes ignored, and repeated misconduct by individual officers goes unaccounted for. Even occasional judicial findings that officers have testified incredibly are not reported routinely to the police department or any oversight agencies.

63. All of the aforementioned has created a climate where police officers and detectives lie to prosecutors and in police paperwork and charging instruments, and testify falsely, with no fear of reprisal. "Informal inquiry by the court and among the judges of this court, as well as knowledge of cases in other federal and state courts, has revealed anecdotal evidence of repeated, widespread falsification by arresting police officers of the New York City Police Department. Despite numerous inquiries by commissions and strong reported efforts by the present administration-through selection of candidates for the police force stressing academic and other qualifications, serious training to avoid constitutional violations, and strong disciplinary action within the department-there is some evidence of an attitude among officers that is sufficiently widespread to constitute a custom or policy by the city approving illegal conduct of the kind now charged." See Colon v. City of New York, et al, 2009 WL 4263362 (E.D.N.Y.)(Weinstein, J.).

64. The City is aware that all of the aforementioned has resulted in violations of citizens' constitutional rights. Despite such notice, the City has failed to take corrective action. This

failure and these policies caused the officers in the present case to violate plaintiffs' civil rights, without fear of reprisal.

65. Plaintiffs have been damaged as a result of the deliberate indifference of the Defendant City.

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs demand judgment against the defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

- A. In favor of plaintiffs in an amount to be determined by a jury for each of plaintiff's causes of action;
- B. Awarding plaintiffs punitive damages in an amount to be determined by a jury;
- C. Awarding plaintiffs reasonable attorneys' fees, costs and disbursements of this action; and
- D. Granting such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

**JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury.

DATED: September 20, 2013  
Brooklyn, New York

TO: New York City  
Corporation Counsel Office  
100 Church Street, 4th floor  
New York, NY 10007

Officer Javier O Munoz Shield #10519  
NYPD – 75<sup>th</sup> Precinct  
1000 Sutter Avenue  
Brooklyn, NY, 11208

Respectfully yours,



By: Nicholas Mindicino, Esq.  
Bar#: NM0437  
Stoll, Glickman & Bellina, LLP  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
475 Atlantic Avenue  
Brooklyn, NY 11217  
P: (718) 852-3710  
F: (718) 852-3586  
[NMindicino@stollglickman.com](mailto:NMindicino@stollglickman.com)